REMARKS

Applicant has cancelled claims 1-12, amended claims 13 and 14, and added new claims 15-16. Accordingly, only claims 13-16 remain in the application. Previous claims were rejected as obvious over Gerrits (6,324,076) in view of Uenaka (5,038,250).

Claim 13, which has been amended, describes an electronic card of a type shown in Fig. 4 where a side of one sheet metal cover part has lugs (47) with inner and outer legs (38, 39) and a fold (43) that joins them. A side of the other sheet metal cover part has a plurality of slots (76) that each has inner and outer sheet metal slot sides that are closely spaced. When a lug is pushed into a slot, the free end (42A) of a leg snaps into a position to abut a horizontal wall (34) and prevent separation of the cover parts.

Gerrits shows, in his Figs. 15-17, a lug with a latch 133 formed by a bend at the top of his arcuate section 130 (Fig. 17). His latch 133 moves inside the edge of a cutout in a horizontal top wall of his bottom shield 108 and snaps outward to abut the sheet metal if his shields begin to separate. However, Gerrits does not show his latch passing into a slot with both inner and outer sides. The advantage of a narrow slot instead of a leg, is that accurate dimensions have to be maintained only for the lug and the width of the sheet metal slot.

In Uenaka, his Fig. 12 shows a hook 25b that enters a slot in a resin frame 2. The tip of his hook free leg does not lie under a sheet metal horizontal wall of his lower panel 5, but instead he uses a resin frame in addition to his top and bottom sheet metal cover parts. Uenaka's card may have to be thicker at its opposite sides because of the long recess 27a with a long tapered lower portion, in his resin frame. Applicant obtains the advantage of the use of simple sheet metal cover parts with sides of small height, and with critical dimensions only of the slot width and of the lugs, which the references do not suggest.

Claim 14, which depends from claim 13, and which has been amended, describes abutting middle walls (33, 34) on the sheet metal covers and emphasizes that the bend (43 in applicant's Fig. 4) is at the extreme bottom of the lug. In Gerrits, his Fig. 17 shows that his bend lies at the bottom of his latch 133 so his bend is not at the bottom of his lug to form two legs. Uenaka's Fig. 12 shows a simple bend at the bottom of his lug, but his lug and slot are not both formed on abutting middle walls. Claim 14 also describes bent cover portions (81 in applicant's Fig. 3) which the references do not suggest.

New claim 15 is similar to amended claim 14 in describing a lug that moves through a slot so the free end of a leg of the lug lies under a sheet metal middle wall.

New claim 16 describes bent cover portions (81 in applicant's Fig. 3) of the lug inner leg. Neither reference shows this.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration of the application is courteously requested. If the Examiner should want to discuss the application, then the Examiner is invited to call Leon D. Rosen at (310) 477-0578.

Respectfully submitted,

Leon D. Rosen
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 21,077

10960 Wilshire Boulevard
Suite 1220
Los Angeles, CA 90024
(310) 477-0578